

1-22-1958

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church in Medieval Thought

Francis L. B. Cunningham

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cunningham, Francis L. B. (1958) "The Relationship Between Mary and the Church in Medieval Thought," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 9, Article 8, Pages 52-78.

Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol9/iss1/8

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlange1@udayton.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARY AND THE CHURCH IN MEDIEVAL THOUGHT

THE doctrine of theologians and ecclesiastical writers with respect to the relationships of Mary and the Church in that fecund period of theological activity and intellectual renaissance which stretches from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries—this may (with the obvious risk of oversimplification) be summed up in a few sentences. In the first place, medieval thought, traditionalist to the core, recognizes Mary as prototype of the Church, following in this the suggestions of Augustine, Ambrose and Bede.¹ Developed under the three terms—mother, spouse and virgin—which represent to medieval eyes the three fundamental aspects of Mary's prefiguring of the mystery of the Church, the analogy is exhaustively worked out by the twelfth century.² This evolution leads inevitably and naturally to the explicit consideration, in theological terms, of the relationships obtaining between Mary and the Church. And this, in turn, enables the theologians of the Middle Ages to disengage many of the elements of the complex concept, Mary-and-the-Church, as we recognize it today.

Yet despite these facts, and the considerable evidence behind them, serious study of this period must lead to the conclusion that that concept is neither fundamental nor truly operative in the Mariology of medieval theology; in medieval thought it does not even become, for example, the object of a

¹ Augustine, *Sermo* 25; *PL* 46, 938; *De symbolo*, 8; *PL* 38, 1064; *Enchiridion*, 34; *PL* 40, 249; *De sancta virginitate*, 2; *PL* 40, 397; etc. Ambrose, *De virginibus*, 2, 2, 6 and 15; *PL* 16, 208 and 210; *In Luc.*, 2, 7; *PL* 15, 1555. Bede sums up these suggestions in a formula, *Dei Genitrix Ecclesia* (*In Luc.* 2, 2; *PL* 92, 330, 331), preserved by the *Glossa ordinaria* (*Biblia sacra cum Glossa ordinaria*: Lyons, 1589; 5, 708); cf. also *In Matt.*, 2; *PL* 92, 13 and 14.

² For a detailed examination of the medieval treatment and development of this typology, cf. H. Barré, C.S.Sp., *Marie et l'Église, du Vénérable Bède à Saint Albert le Grand*, in *BSFEM* 9 (1951) 63-87.

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 53

synthesis.³ Perforce one must agree with the erudite Père Barré: even the idea of the Mother of God as prototype of the Church is an exceptional one in the main stream of medieval theology; the relationships between Mary and the Church never become a major preoccupation with medieval thinkers of the first rank.⁴

Within the necessary space-time limitations of a paper such as this, we cannot hope successfully to develop or even defend these asserted conclusions. At best, concentrating upon that area of the doctrine illustrated most explicitly in theological terms, we shall offer a series of examples indicative both of the serious advance made by these Christian centuries over the traditional data they received and conserved, and of the lacunae—at times surprising, on occasion significant for our own appreciation of this important thesis in Mariology—which a science yet callow inevitably reveals.

We shall here consider, then, the relationships between Mary and the Church as disclosed by an explicit theology in the period from Bede to the great era of Scholasticism which closes with the death of St. Albert.⁵ To avoid misconceptions, a general survey of the matter from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries will be presented as a background against

³ With the possible exception of the sermon of Godfrey of St. Victor (Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 1002; cited in Barré, *art. cit.*, *passim*), there is no attempt to consider explicitly the complete significance of the Mary-Church relationships; on the contrary, the various elements exposed are treated only incidentally and accidentally.

⁴ Cf. *art. cit.*, 125. This conclusion directly contradicts—but for reasons the sufficiency of which cannot here be demonstrated—the propositions of A. Piolanti, *Mater Unitatis*, in *Mm* 11 (1949) 423-439, and *Maria et Ecclesia*, in *ED* 4 (1951) 324-338, as well as those of I. Riudor, *Maria mediadora y Madre del Cristo místico en los escritores eclesiásticos de la primera mitad del siglo XII*, in *EE* 25 (1951) 181-218.

⁵ Scholars are in general agreement as to the fact that this relationship receives but scant attention (and never a formal treatment, even in the medieval sense) until the notion is revived by Scheeben in the last century. Surely this is significant.

54 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

which the contributions of medieval thought in exploring the Mary-Church relationships may be evaluated. It is these considerations which shall constitute the major burden of this essay.

I

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF MEDIEVAL THOUGHT

If one eschews nuances, and distinctions of interest only to the specialist, it is easy enough to reduce the trends in medieval consideration of the relationships between Mary and the Church to four stages: development, transition, exploration, and consolidation.

1. *Period of Development.* Covering the eighth and ninth centuries (the first awakenings of Christian civilization from the deep sleep of the so-called Dark Ages), the first stage in the consideration of the present problem embraces the Carolingian theologians. As previously remarked, the great merit of this particular era is, first of all, to receive wholeheartedly the tradition bequeathed by the Fathers, according to which Our Lady is the type, image, or figure of the Church. Yet this is far from all. The very first of these writers of any prominence, Ambrose Autpert (+785)—the teacher of Alcuin, Haymon, and Remi of Auxerre, among others—indicates, in a commentary on the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, how fecund this patristic notion is to become:

Mulier amicta sole, ac si diceretur: Beata semperque virgo Maria, obumbrata Altissimi virtute. . . . Et quia plerumque genus invenitur in specie, ipsa beata ac pia virgo hoc loco personam gerit Ecclesiae, quae novos quotidie populos parit, ex quibus et generale mediatoris corpus formatur.

Non autem mirum, si illa typum Ecclesiae praetendat, in cuius utero capiti suo eadem Ecclesia uniri meruit. Nam et in sequenti lectione aliqua narrantur, quae iuxta literam specialiter congruere non possunt, sed electorum Ecclesiae secundum mys-

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 55

ticam narrationem generaliter conveniunt. Sequamur ergo per omnia genus in specie, et totum etiam quod uni aptari posse videmus, de omnibus dictum intelligamus. Dicatur igitur mulier amicta sole, quod omnino aptissime fidelium animabus convenit. . . .

Et in utero habens. . . . Haec beatæ virginis Mariæ secundum literam aptari nequeunt, quia cruciatum in partu habere non potuit, quæ nullum peccatum libidinis in conceptu contraxit. Sed iuxta mysticum intellectum certissime ad Ecclesiam refertur, cuius excellentissimum membrum ipsa beata virgo esse cognoscitur.⁶

This passage, of a work whose historical influence is as unquestionable as it is incalculable, enunciates four points of vast importance in the future development of the doctrine concerning Mary and the Church: (1) Mary, because of her divine maternity, is the prototype of the Church (*typus Ecclesiae*); (2) hence one may validly use the fourth exegetical rule of Tychonius—*de specie et genere*⁷—applying to the genus (the Church) what is said of the species (Mary), and vice versa;⁸ (3) Mary's supereminence with respect to the

⁶ *In Apoc.*, 5, *Max. Bibl. Patrum* (Lyons, 1677), 13, 530-531; cited in Barré, *art. cit.*, 118.

⁷ *Liber de septem regulis*, regula 4; *PL* 18, 33-46. Although Tychonius was a Donatist, his codification of the principles of scriptural interpretation was explicitly approved by Augustine and well known in the Middle Ages through the use made of his rules by Cassiodorus, Isidore, Bede, and others. Autpert may, in fact, have actually used Tychonius' commentary on the Apocalypse, since he refers to it in his Preface.

⁸ "Monstratur species in genere, sicut et genus per species declaratur," a sermon of Pseudo-Ildephonsus (Paschasius Radbertus?) states (*Sermo 1*; *PL* 96, 250). Thus, though the passage cited shows the transference from species to genus, with the obverse only hinted at, the general tendency will be to give a Marian interpretation to texts which concern the Church. This eventuates with Rupert of Deutz (*In Cantica Canticorum*; *PL* 168, 839-962) and Honorius Augustodunensis (*Sigillum Beatae Mariæ*; *PL* 172, 495-518. Cf. *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*, of unknown authorship but probably his; *PL* 172, 519-542) in the twelfth century, in the Marian interpretation of the total

56 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

Church (*cuius excellentissimum membrum ipsa beata virgo esse cognoscitur*); and (4) Mary as personification of the Church (*pia virgo hoc loco personam gerit Ecclesiae*).⁹

But despite the fact that Ambrose's disciples—Alcuin, Haymon, and perhaps Berengaud¹⁰—imitate his exegetical method and adopt his conclusions with respect to Mary and the Church, there is no direct development of his ideas until

work previously and traditionally construed as an allegory of the Church. On the other hand, the opposite procedure will find analogues in the events of Mary's life which reveal an ecclesiastical sense. Thus Bede, *In Luc.*, 1, 2; *PL* 92, 330 and 334. Ambrose Autpert, *In Purif.*, 4, 5, 12 and 13; *PL* 89, 1294, 1295, 1301 (and following him Hervé of Bourg-Dieu, *In Purif.*; *PL* 158, 621; Bruno of Asti, *In Leviticum*, 12, and *In Purif.*; *PL* 164, 421 and 165, 1027; Peter of Blois, *In Purif.*, 2; *PL* 208, 597; St. Bonaventure, *In Purif.*, 1; Quaracchi ed., 9, 634). Haymon, *Homil. de tempore*, 13; *PL* 118, 86 and 87. Rupert of Deutz, *In Ioannem*, 2; *PL* 169, 285.

⁹ What Ambrose here affirms on the plane of scriptural interpretation alone—that Mary stands for the Church—will be extended by later theologians to specify her role and relations with the Church. Philip the Chancellor (*Summa*, 3, d. 3, q. 27) holds that, at the Passion, “in sola Virgine stetit Ecclesia, cuius fides sola remansit,” an opinion explicitly approved by the *Summa Alexandri* (pars 3, inq. 2, tract. 2, quaest. 2, tit. 1, cap. 2, 11; Quaracchi ed. 4, 1130) and incorporated by St. Bonaventure in his commentary on the Sentences (*In 3 Sent.*, dist. 3, pars 1, art. 2, quaest. 3, ad 2; Quaracchi ed. 3, 78; so also Hugh of St. Victor, Richard of St. Lawrence, and many others; references in Barré, *art. cit.*, note 230). St. Thomas will bring this idea to its ultimate fruition, pointing out (apparently casually) that it is the whole human race, the entire Church, which, through Mary, consents to the Incarnate Union, the nuptials of Christ and the Church: “per annuntiationem expectabatur consensus Virginis loco totius humanae naturae” (*Summa Theologiae*, 3, q. 30, a. 1; cf. ad 1).

¹⁰ Alcuin, *Comm. in Apoc.*, 5, *PL* 100, 152-153. Haymon, *In Apoc.*, 5; *PL* 117, 1081-1082. Berengaud, *Exp. in Apoc.*, c. 12; *PL* 17, 960. The dates of this last writer are very uncertain, estimates placing him from the ninth to the twelfth century (cf. H. Hurter, S.J., *Nomenclator Literarius*, 1, 830; 2, 6 and 7); his use of the term *Mater nostra* in this very passage strongly suggests that the later dating is preferable. He would not, then, be an immediate disciple of Ambrose Autpert.

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 57

the twelfth century. Nonetheless, Paschasius Radbert (fl. 860) will, a century later, independently explore the typological theme (derived, of course, from his masters, Augustine and Ambrose), utilizing the fourth rule of Tychonius in the process. This significant, even remarkable, analysis of the traditional concept merits full citation:

Cum esset, inquit, desponsata mater Jesu Maria Joseph. Ubi primum recte quaeritur quid sit quod Isaias simplicem virginem repromittat dicens (7:14): "Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium," beatus vero evangelista desponsatam eam nominat, quam etiam pari assensu virginem confitetur. . . . Nisi forte fatendum quod Isaias hoc praedixit nondum credentibus, ex vocabulo quod fieret omnibus in miraculum: evangelista vero, rei veritatem aperiens, insinuat quod est etiam et nobis in mysterium. Quia quamvis Evangelium non sit iam umbra, sed veritas, propter mystica tamen doctrinarum eloquia, non apices, non litterae, non syllabae, non verbum, non nomina, non persona in eo divinis vacua sunt figuris.

Hinc est nimirum rei negotium, quod hic sponsa quaeritur, ut per eam omnino iam tunc futura Christi universalis Ecclesia signetur ad desponsandum, et colligatur genus in specie iuxta illud quod Osea propheta fatetur dicens: "Sponsabo te mihi misericordia et miserationibus, et desponsabo te mihi in fide" (2:19-20). Quid enim aliud est dicere, *desponsabo te mihi in fide*, nisi monstrare quod Maria per fidem de Spiritu sancto Christum conceperit? Ubi nimirum universalis Ecclesia praesignatur tandem de Spiritu sancto replenda, per quem in cordibus credentium et ipsa Christum quotidie non solum parit, quia mater et virgo est, etiam sponsa in omnibus appellatur. . . . Unde hic, ut diximus, praeparatur iam in specie mater sponsa, ut postmodum per hanc carnis unionem Ecclesia in genere congregetur. Quippe quia tota, per hoc quod Verbum caro factum est, velut membra colligitur in corpore, et unita Christo per gratiam iam tum sponsa Christo paratur in thalamum.

Hanc igitur volens beatus evangelista electionis gratiam prae-

58 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

signari in Maria, primum commendat sponsam, quam virginem per omnia postea confitetur, et totum, ut dixi, simul praefigi in specie, quod faciendum adhuc erat in genere.¹¹

The first stage of the medieval consideration of the relations between Mary and the Church unfortunately closes with this definitive statement of the principles—scriptural interpretation and theological typology—which will eventually lead to fruitful conclusions.¹² Like the insights of Autpert, these developments of Paschasius have little influence on his contemporaries or immediate successors; two centuries will have to elapse before the considerable theological gains represented in the passage cited eventuate in the applications and developments one might naturally anticipate from them.¹³

2. *Period of Transition.* It is tempting to stigmatize the tenth and eleventh centuries, comprising the second stage in medieval consideration of Mary and the Church, as sterile and unproductive. For in terms of progress, of theological

¹¹ *In Matt.*, 2; *PL* 120, 103, and 104. Besides the references cited in note 1, cf. Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 146; *PL* 52, 591-594. There are echoes here of Autpert (*In Purif.* 5; *PL* 89, 1295), but they would seem to be coincidental rather than derivative.

¹² The first sermons attributed to Ildephonsus (*Sermo* 1; *PL* 96, 214; *Sermo* 3; *PL* 96, 250, 256-257) repeat some of these assertions, but these may well be Paschasius' own. His chief influence on later ages will be the letter *Cogitis me* (*PL* 30, 122-142) which affirms Mary's place and role in the Church on the basis of her fullness of grace; widely circulated as a letter of Jerome, this becomes a prime *auctoritas* in medieval theology, and is cited as such by St. Thomas (among others), *Summa Theologiae*, 3, q. 27, a. 5 (Utrum Beata Virgo per sanctificationem in utero obtinuerit gratiae plenitudinem), *Sed Contra*.

¹³ One finds allusions to our subject—but no trace of influence of any significance from Autpert or Radbert—made by Haymo (+853) (*Homilia* 13; *PL* 118, 86; *Homilia* 70; *PL* 118, 446), Rabanus Maurus (+856) (*De universo*, 4, 1; *PL* 111, 75), Hincmar of Rheims (+882) (*Vita S. Remigii*, 12; *PL* 125, 1140), and Remigius of Auxerre (+908) (*Homil.* 5; *PL* 131, 891); with them the era of the Carolingian renaissance may properly be brought to a close, so far as our study is concerned.

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 59

advancement of originality and discovery and dogmatic evolution, these 200 years are dark ages indeed.¹⁴ Yet such a judgment would be historically invalid and most misleading. These centuries have their great contribution to make to the intellectual life of the Church in general, to theology in particular, and in a special way to the theological study of the problem before us.

The contribution of these years, of these men—Atto of Vercelli (+961), Ratherius of Verona (+974), Fulbert of Chartres (+1028), Odilo of Cluny (+1049), Lanfranc (+1089), Gottschalk of Limburg (+1098), even St. Anselm of Canterbury (+1109)—is to pass on faithfully the traditional typology: Mary is the Church. This may seem no great thing—original it certainly is not. Yet neither is it a sterile repetition of doctrinal bromides. For the tenth and eleventh centuries mark the perpetuation and extension of the monastic schools inaugurated under Charlemagne, and the establishment, in even greater number, of the cathedral schools. To them will flock the elite of an awakened Christendom, there to be trained in classical culture and dialectics. And this schooling will lay the foundations for the philosophical revival of the following centuries and for the theological enterprises which are the fruit of the trained Christian mind which seeks an understanding of the mysteries of faith. This is a period, then, not—as so often thought—of sterility, of stagnation, intellectually dormant if not actually moribund; on the contrary, this is the necessary period of gestation which permits

¹⁴ Baronius characterized the tenth century as an age “quod sui asperitate ac boni sterilitate ferreum, malique exeuntis deformitate plumbeum, atque inopia scriptorum appellari consuevit obscurum” (*Annales ecclesiastici*, a. 900), a remark that could, with but slight exaggeration, be equally applied to the eleventh century. As Father de Ghellinck points out, theology at this time had yet to acquire any scientific character at all, consisting of little more than the intelligent reading of the Scriptures and Fathers, and a knowledge of the creeds, canons, and the liturgy (*Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* [Paris, 1914], 34).

60 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

the slow maturing of ideas as yet too undeveloped to survive in the adult world of thought.

The insights of Autpert and Radbert are not lost, not denied. They are preserved, handed down from generation to generation in the concise notion that God's Mother typifies, prefigures, presages God's Church. They are a vital, if not essential and hardly even integral, part of a theological tradition pregnant with new life. In due season the Carolingian development of the original patristic typology will bear its expected fruit, *because* it was so carefully nurtured in the schools of the tenth and eleventh century.

3. *Period of Exploration.* The theologically fecund twelfth century witnesses one of the greatest resurgences of intellectual activity in the whole history of human thought—a revival carefully prepared for by the previous ages, as we have noted, not a creationist production *ex nihilo*. It is no surprise, accordingly, to find that so fertile a time, so favorable an intellectual climate for discovery, should concern itself with the yet unexplored possibilities of the Marian typology suggested by the Marian interpretation of Scripture; it is no surprise that it should, in consequence, and more formally, give explicit theological consideration to the relations obtaining between Mary and the Church.¹⁵

The century begins with the grateful acceptance of the typological ideas bequeathed it by the preceding periods: the parallelism between Mary and the Church is canonized, so to say, by its inclusion as official doctrine of the age in the *Glossa ordinaria*.¹⁶ Firmly rooted in tradition, this idea will

¹⁵ Cf. Barré, *art. cit.*, 63-87, for the medieval analysis of the Mary-Church analogy under the three aspects of spouse, mother, and virgin. Since this will be the ground from which the medieval theology of Mary and the Church rises, and is thus at least implicitly contained in their theological speculations, it was thought better to concentrate on these (Section II) in this small paper.

¹⁶ "Quae de Ecclesia generaliter hic dicuntur ad Mariam specialiter referri possunt," *In Ps. 44*; *ed. cit.*, 3, 745. Cf. Peter Lombard, *In Ps. 44*; *PL* 191,

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 61

become a supple tool in the hands of men like Rupert of Deutz (+1135), Isaac of Stella (+1169), Serlon of Savigny (+1158), and Godfrey of St. Victor (+1194)—to name only the most prominent. It will become an instrument to mine the hidden theological riches of the interrelationships of Mary and the Church, a principle to produce enlightening conclusions and to direct further explorations in the unknown areas of Mariology and ecclesiology.

This effort *is* original—sometimes daring, always provocative, and only on occasion misdirected or exaggerated. It results in a doctrine of Mary and the Church which, despite its lacunae, reveals in historical perspective a brilliance attesting to its perennial value. The next section of this paper will attempt to manifest this permanent contribution of these twelfth century theologians to our knowledge of Mary and of the Church.

For the present, it will suffice to cite the beautiful and well-known sermon of the Cistercian abbot, Isaac of Stella, on the Assumption:

746; Bruno of Asti, *In Ps.* 44; *PL* 164, 857 and 858. The complementary parallelism is also explicitly recognized by the Gloss, the espousals of the Virgin being interpreted as a figure of the nuptials between Christ and His Church; *In Matt.*, 1, 18 (citing Origen); *ed. cit.*, 5, 43; cf. the parallel passages of Luke (1: 27 and 2; 5; *ed. cit.*, 5, 683 and 708) where Ambrose and Bede are quoted, and the commentary on Apoc. 12, 1 (*ed. cit.*, 6, 1575-1579) which gives extracts from Andrew of Caesarea, Haymon, and Berengaud (quoted as Ambrose) for the Marian interpretation of the woman clothed with the sun, construed by the Gloss more directly as a figure of the Church.

This is an interesting and significant fact, since the original commentary of Walafrid Strabo (+840) is revised and elaborated under Anselm of Laon (+1117) along the lines of a more *literal* interpretation (cf. Hurter, *op. cit.*, 2, 21-23), as was the general tendency of the age (cf. C. Spicq, O.P., *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge* [Paris, 1944], 94 ff.). It cannot be denied, however, that the Gloss does little more than state the principle (and that infrequently), although on its authority the "mystical reason" for the espousals of Mary and Joseph will be universally adopted by succeeding theologians (St. Albert, St. Bonaventure, and St. Thomas among them) and incorporated in their masterpieces (cf. Barré, *art. cit.*, 130-131, note 133).

62 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

Unus enim totus ac solus Christus, caput et corpus; unus autem is unius Dei in caelis et unius matris in terra, et multi filii et unus filius. Sicut namque caput et membra, unus et plures filii, sic Maria et Ecclesia una mater et plures, una virgo et plures. Utraque mater, utraque virgo; utraque de eodem Spiritu sine libidine concipit, utraque Deo Patri sine peccato prolem fundit. Illa absque omni peccato corpori caput peperit, ista in omnium peccatorum remissione capiti corpus edidit. Utraque Christi mater, sed neutra sine altera totum parit. Unde in Scripturis divinitus inspiratis, quod de Virgine matre Ecclesia universaliter, hoc de Virgine Maria singulariter; et quod de virgine matre Maria specialiter, id de virgine matre Ecclesia generaliter iure intelligitur; et cum de alterutra sermo teritur, fere permixtim et indifferenter de utraque sententia intelligitur. Unaquaeque etiam fidelis anima, Verbi Deo sponsa, Christi mater, filia et soror, virgo et fecunda suapte ratione intelligitur. Dicitur ergo universaliter pro Ecclesia, et specialiter pro Maria, singulariter quoque pro fideli anima, ab ipsa Dei Sapientia, quod Patris est Verbum.¹⁷

This remarkable passage is of interest not only as an example of similarly remarkable declarations by Guerric of Igny (+1155),¹⁸ Serlon of Savigny,¹⁹ Hugh of St. Victor,²⁰ and Garin of St. Victor.²¹ It significantly points up the fact that we discover the sentiment of the twelfth century about Mary and the Church in the works of devotional writers and in ser-

¹⁷ *Sermo 51 in Assumptione*; PL 194, 1863 (punctuation added). Cf. *Sermo 42 in Ascensione Domini*; PL 194, 1832; *Sermo 45 in die Pentecostes*, 3; PL 194, 1841.

¹⁸ *In Assumptione B. Mariae*, 1, 2 and 3; PL 185, 187-188.

¹⁹ *In Assumptione B. Mariae and In Nativitate B. Mariae*; *Bibl. Patrum Cisterc.*, edited by J. B. Tissier, 6 (Bonofonte, 1664), 115 and 117.

²⁰ *Sermo de Assumptione B. Virginis*; PL 177, 1211.

²¹ *In Assumptione B. Mariae*; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin Ms. 14588, 174^v and 175. (Reference here and for note 19 from Barré, *art. cit.*, 127, note 28).

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 63

mons, *not* in the scriptural commentaries or in works (even of the same authors) of a strictly theological nature.

Rupert of Deutz (+1135) and Honorius Augustodunensis (fl. 1135), to be sure, interpret the entire Canticle of Canticles in a Marian sense, and their example is followed by other commentators, like Richard of St. Victor (+1173), Geoffrey of Auxerre (fl. 1180), Philip of Harvengt (+1182), Allan of Lille (+1202), and Alexander Neckham (+1215). But the Marian interpretation is here (as is also the case with the commentaries on the woman clothed with the sun, Apocalypse, 12, 1) simply juxtaposed to the traditional ecclesiastical interpretations. There is no compenetration, no examination of mutual relations, no comparison: they simply co-exist. And this same casual and accidental juxtaposition is observed also by those works, called *Distinctiones*, which list, in alphabetical order, difficult terms, and give the various possible interpretations. Under the headings *Mater*, *Virgo*, *templum*, *civitas*, *luna*, etc., both Marian and ecclesiastical meanings will be listed—without referring one to the other, or comparing them in any way.

The consideration of the relations of Mary and the Church is, then, a labor of love rather than of science, of rhetoric rather than of dialectic, of devotion and spirituality rather than of theology. In large measure it is a labor carried on by the sons and disciples of St. Bernard and by the Victorines—a fact which leads one writer to conclude, in a too facile distinction, that it is the fervent product of “monastic theology” rather than of “scholastic theology.”²²

Thus, great and original as is the contribution of these students of Mary with respect to the relations between her and the Church—brilliant in insights and fecund in conclusions—it is by no means complete or exhaustive or systematic. It is surely enough that the twelfth century made the progress

²² A. Piolanti, *Maria et Ecclesia*, in *ED* 4 (1951) 324.

64 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

it did, that it should achieve the developments which stamp it as singularly fruitful as it was singularly devout. The lack of order, the great gaps of knowledge, conclusions unglimped or unproven, the exaggeration in extending and applying certain principles—these are certainly defects. But there is a more serious and fundamental imperfection (historically as explicable as the other deficiencies noted) which must first be remedied—namely, the *theological* validation of notions which have received only a rhetorical elaboration. Are these insights of the scholars of the twelfth century into the relations of Mary and the Church only romantic conceptions? Will they vanish in the hard light of theological reality? Are they allegory and fanciful rhetoric, or fact and virtual revelation? The next century will provide the answers to these and similar questions.

4. *Period of Consolidation.* The thirteenth century, at first glance, manifests none of the originality nor even the concern for our subject which characterizes its predecessor. In this respect, it would seem to bear the same relation to the preceding era as the tenth and eleventh century bore to the Carolingian epoch: the simple transmission of ideas acquired by previous thinkers.

To a degree this historical conclusion is true. Not even in the sermons—the rhetorical expressions—of the thinkers of this age will we discover anything new, any advance of thought, any development or application of principles. Still less will such progress with respect to the Mary-Church parallelism be detectable in their major theological works, the commentaries on Scripture and on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the great Summas of theology. Certain specialized works manifest greater interest: the *Speculum Beatae Mariae Virginis*, of Conrad of Saxony (+1279), the *Mariale* of James of Varagine (+1298) and that of Servas Sanctus of Faenza. But the only addition, the only thing original, is the emphasis

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 65

placed by St. Albert the Great on Mary's co-operation in our salvation and his full treatment (which St. Thomas preserves) of her fullness of grace—truly a step forward, of such value as to be imitated by the *Mariale* of Ps.-Albert and by Richard of St. Lawrence in his *De Laudibus*.²³

Despite this lack of originality, however, the contribution of the thirteenth century is, theologically speaking, of great importance. Concentrating upon Mary's maternity and her fullness of grace, theological speculation of this age establishes firmly the fundamental principles of Mariology. Theology can then examine, in the light of these certain principles, the conclusions and suggestions offered by the explorations of "monastic theology," choosing those which fit the theological facts, rejecting others which contradict general principles or specifically Marian ones, and incorporating into its syntheses the critically selected conclusions. Thus it establishes, on firm scientific grounds, the sometimes precocious insights of the twelfth century; and it eliminates, as unfruitful avenues of approach, those suggestions, based only upon romantic imagination or rhetorical fancy, which are inconsonant not only with theology's method but even with its immediately or virtually revealed principles.

In brief, theologians of the thirteenth century consolidate the great gains of their immediate predecessors in the field of Mary-Church relationships. They put an official stamp of approval, so to say, on the tentative excursions that might otherwise have been considered as pious reflections or devout imaginings. In so doing, they establish these Marian conclusions as principles for further investigation. Thus Richard of

²³ Once attributed to St. Albert the Great, the *Mariale* can no longer be regarded as genuine (cf. A. Fries, C.S.S.R., *Die unter dem Namen des Albertus Magnus überlieferten mariologischen Schriften*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, 37, 4 (Münster, 1954). The *De Laudibus* of Richard of St. Lawrence will be found in Vol. 20 of St. Albert's *Opera omnia*, edited by Jammy.

66 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

St. Lawrence canonizes the current opinion that *in sola Virgine stetit Ecclesia, cuius fides sola permansit in passione*,²⁴ and St. Thomas points out that at the Annunciation the consent of Mary is sought and given *loco totius humanae naturae*. Yet the rich reflections on the relationship between Mary and the Church which these ideas might lead to are not forthcoming; later theologians, all but down to our own day, will leave unexploited and unexplored the authoritative suggestions of the great doctors and masters of the thirteenth century. With them, in point of fact, the medieval study of Mary and the Church comes to a close.

Thus is the natural termination as well of our historical survey, for we can now consider the medieval doctrine against this background and in historical context.

II

THE MEDIEVAL DOCTRINE OF MARY AND THE CHURCH

Medieval consideration of the relations between Mary and the Church begins with the fact which is central in Marian tradition: hers is a supereminent excellence and hers thereby a supereminent place in the Church of Christ. Explicitly stated by Augustine,²⁵ repeated by Ambrose Autpert,²⁶ Haymon,²⁷ and Berengaud,²⁸ amplified by Serlon of Savigny²⁹ and Godfrey of St. Victor³⁰ in calling Mary "head" of the Church,³¹

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, pars. 2, 96. For other references, cf. note 9.

²⁵ "Maria portio est Ecclesiae, sanctum membrum, excellens membrum, supereminens membrum, sed tamen totius corporis membrum," *Sermo* 25, 7; *PL* 46, 938.

²⁶ *In Apoc.*, 5; *ed. cit.*, 531.

²⁷ *In Apoc.*, 3, 12; *PL* 117, 1081.

²⁸ *In Apoc.*, 12, 3; *PL* 117, 876.

²⁹ *In Assumptione B. Mariae*; *ed. cit.*, 6, 115.

³⁰ *In Nativitate B. Mariae*; quoted in Barré, *art. cit.*, 88.

³¹ The phrase, a little strange to our ears, has a perfectly orthodox meaning, signifying, as Godfrey of St. Victor points out (cf. Barré, *art. cit.*, 93),

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 67

Mary's excellence is attested to by St. Bonaventure³² and Richard of St. Lawrence³³ in the thirteenth century, and particularly by the singular remark of St. Thomas that she is, by her divine maternity, *quasi tota repleta divinitate*.³⁴

Mary's pre-eminence is founded first of all, the medieval writers insist, upon her divine maternity. "Mira res," exclaims St. Anselm in his great prayer to the Virgin, "in quam sublimi contemplor Mariam locatam. Nihil est aequale Mariae; nihil, nisi Deus, maius Maria. Deus Filium suum . . . ipsum dedit Mariae."³⁵ The fact is explicitly recognized by Rupert of Deutz (+1135) and Helinand of Froidmont (+c 1229),³⁶ and culminates in the profound explanation of St. Thomas which places Our Lady in the hypostatic order. "From the fact that she is the mother of God," the Angelic Doctor states, "(Mary) has a certain infinite dignity, from the infinite good which is God."³⁷

A second reason for Mary's dignity, even more frequently cited, is found in her fullness of grace. This special privilege, already pointed out by Paschasius Radbert,³⁸ enables Abelard (+1142) to compare Mary with the entire Church;³⁹ it is a point of resemblance, Alan of Lille (+1202) states, which

the priority of time which Mary enjoys with respect to other members of the Church (not, of course, with respect to Christ) and her supereminence.

³² *De Nativitate B. Mariae*; Quaracchi ed., 9, 708.

³³ *De Laudibus*, 5, 2; *Opera omnia S. Alberti Magni*, 20 (Jammy ed.), 172.

³⁴ *Lectura super Evangelium S. Matt.*, 1, 18; Cai ed. (Rome, 1951), n. 108.

³⁵ *Oratio 52 ad S. Virginem Mariam*; *PL* 158, 956. His disciple Eadmer (+1124) echoes this sentiment exactly, *De Conceptione*; *PL* 159, 307.

³⁶ Rupert, *In Apoc.*, 7, 12; *PL* 169, 1043. Helinand, *Sermo 22 in Nativitate B. Mariae*; *PL* 212, 667.

³⁷ *Summa Theologiae*, 1, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4; cf. *1 Sent.*, dist. 44, q. 1, a. 3.

³⁸ *Cogitis me*, 5; *PL* 30, 127. As the purported letter of Jerome (for correct attribution, cf. T. A. Agius, *On Pseudo-Jerome, epistle 9*, in *JTS* 24 [1923] 176-183), this letter will have wide influence in the Middle Ages. Cf. note 12.

³⁹ *In Assumptione*; *PL* 178, 540.

68 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

indicates the parallelism between Mary and the Church.⁴⁰ The idea that she possesses the fullness of God's gifts, distributed only partially to other members of the Church, is summed up in St. Albert's question: "Quid enim decoris Ecclesiae est, quod non inveniatur in Maria?"⁴¹ The *Liber Saluatorius*,⁴² Ps.-Albert,⁴³ Richard of St. Lawrence,⁴⁴ Conrad of Saxony⁴⁵—all make this doctrine their own.

Two important consequences follow immediately from this consideration of Mary's excellence. First, she precedes the Church in time: she is "the beginning of salvation," in the phrase of Peter Chrysologus⁴⁶ utilized by Peter Damian (+1073),⁴⁷ the *consummatio Synagogae . . . et Ecclesiae sanctae nova inchoatio*, as Gerhoh of Reichersberg (+1169), disciple of Rupert of Deutz, expresses it.⁴⁸ For, in the words of Nicholas of Clairvaux (fl. 1176), "filius Dei totus et integer eructatus est de corde Patris in uterum Mariae, de ventre Matris in gremium Ecclesiae."⁴⁹ So, too, Mary's glorification indicates her precedence, it being, after Christ's, the first fruit and measure of the Church's own. Serlon of Savigny develops this aspect fully:

Per ipsam Christus Dei filius venit ad nos, assumpta humanitate redemit nos, resurrectione et ascensione sua vivificavit nos, et ad coelestia sublimavit; et hodierna die beatam Virginem

⁴⁰ "Sicut Ecclesia in diversis personis habet universitatem donorum, sic Virgo Maria in se universitatem charismatum," *In Cant.*, 1; *PL* 210, 60.

⁴¹ *In Luc.*, 2, 16; *Opera omnia*, 10 (Jammy ed.), 110.

⁴² Quoted in Barré, *art. cit.*, 90.

⁴³ *Mariale*, q. 43, n. 2; *ed. cit.*, 20, 42.

⁴⁴ *De Laudibus*, 4, 4, 14; *ed. cit.*, 108.

⁴⁵ *Speculum B. Mariae Virginis*, 7; in *Opera omnia S. Bonaventurae* (Vivès ed.), 14, 254.

⁴⁶ *Sermo* 146; *PL* 52, 593.

⁴⁷ *In Nativitate B. Mariae*; *PL* 144, 753.

⁴⁸ *De gloria et honore filii hominis*, 10; *PL* 194, 1105.

⁴⁹ *De S. Victore*; *PL* 144, 733. Cf. Peter Comestor (+1178), *PL* 171, 412, which seems to be Nicholas' source.

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 69

matrem suam de seculo nequam assumens, post se super choros Angelorum exaltavit. Unde nobis firmam et indubitabilem fiduciam ascendi praebebat, si vitam eius et mores voluerimus imitare. Non est enim personarum acceptor Deus, sed in omni gente, qui timet Dominum et operatur iustitiam acceptus est illi (Act., 10, 34). Quae admodum assumpta est igitur beata Maria, iure post eam assumenda creditur Ecclesia. Ipsa est enim et caput et principale membrum Ecclesiae, et spes prima post Deum. . . .

Sic beata Maria a superno sponso vocata, ad aethereum thalamum est assumpta, et post eam Ecclesia assumenda est. Illa praecedit, haec sequitur.⁵⁰

Both in time and in dignity, therefore, Our Lady precedes the Church.⁵¹ Hence a second consequence of her eminence, immediately following from the first: Mary prefigures the Church and is its prototype—*ipsa caput et exemplum nostrum. Unde ipsa in Ecclesia et Ecclesia in ipsa figuratur*.⁵² The development of medieval Marian thought thus comes back to its starting point, but with an immeasurably deeper grasp of the Augustinian insight which leads naturally to further precision and more specific determinations.

Mary's excellence being such, the obvious theological task will be to define her place with regard to the Church. This specification will, in turn, pose a sequent question of greatest importance: what precisely is her role with regard to the Church? Under these two main headings the major medieval thought on the relationships between Mary and the Church may be summed up.

⁵⁰ *In Assumptione*, 1; *ed. cit.*, 115.

⁵¹ As Rupert of Deutz points out, the Church in its totality is anterior in time to Mary, since it comprises the elect of the Old Testament (*De victoria Verbi Dei*, 12, 1 on Apoc., 12; *PL* 169, 1463 and 1464); these authors, obviously, are considering Mary's relationship to the Church posterior to Christ. Her priority of dignity knows, of course, no such restriction.

⁵² Serlon de Savigny, *In Nativitate B. Mariae*, 6; *ed. cit.*, 117.

70 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

A. MARY'S PLACE IN THE CHURCH

The consideration of Mary's pre-eminence establishes the fact that she is closest of all creatures to Christ—*prima post Filium, quem ex se genuit incarnatum, iussa est residere*⁵³ and thus superior to the Church. Yet she is not separated from the Church, she remains a member while still occupying an intermediary position between Christ and His Spouse. "Supereminens membrum, sed tamen totius corporis membrum," St. Augustine had said,⁵⁴ and the medieval theologians unhesitatingly affirm the same fact.

This is evident, first of all, because she is situated between the Old and the New Testaments—*confinium veteris et novae legis*, to use St. Thomas' phrase, *sicut aurora diei et noctis*.⁵⁵ The implications of this position *in medio Ecclesiae*⁵⁶ are analyzed in a beautiful and influential passage by St. Bernard:

Et tunc iam operabatur (Christus) salutem nostram *in medio terrae* (Ps. 73, 12), in utero Virginis Mariae, quae mirabili proprietate, terrae medium appellatur. Ad illam enim, sicut ad medium, sicut ad arcam Dei, sicut ad rerum causam, sicut ad negotium saeculorum, respiciunt et qui in coelo habitant, et qui in inferno, et qui nos praecesserunt, et nos qui sumus, et qui sequuntur, et nati natorum, et qui nascuntur ab illis. Illi qui sunt in coelo, ut resarciuntur; et qui in inferno, ut eripiuntur; qui sequuntur, ut glorificentur. Eo *beatam te dicent*

⁵³ Amedeus of Lausanne (+1150), *Homilia 4 de Beata Maria*; PL 188, 1343. Cf. Odilo of Cluny (+1049), *In Assumptione* (PL 142, 1028); Isaac of Stella, *In Assumptione*, 1 (PL 194, 1862); Richard of St. Victor (+1173), *In Cant.*, 39 (PL 196, 517); Peter of Celle, (+1180), *In Purif.* (PL 202, 675 and 676); Conrad of Saxony (+1279), *Speculum B. Mariae Virginis*, 11, ed. cit., 264.

⁵⁴ *Sermo 25*, 7; PL 46, 938.

⁵⁵ *In 4 Sent.*, dist. 30, q. 2, sol. 1, ad 1.

⁵⁶ Philip of Harvengt (+1182), *In Cant.*, 2, 6 (PL 203, 260); Peter of Blois (+1200), *Sermo 38 in Nativitate B. Mariae* (PL 207, 677); Adam of Perseigne (+1203), *Fragmen. 4* (PL 211, 752).

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 71

omnes generationes (Luc., 1, 48), Genitrix Dei, domina mundi, regina coeli. Omnes, inquam, generationes. . . .

Merito in te respiciunt oculi totius creaturae, quia in te, et per te, et de te, benigna manus omnipotentis quidquid creaverat recreavit.⁵⁷

For this reason Adam of Perseigne entitles Mary *Mediatoris mater mediatrix*,⁵⁸ and the term becomes current at the end of the twelfth century with the realization that Mary, being constituted between Christ and the Church, mediates not only between the two Testaments but between Christ and man.⁵⁹ This considerable step forward in analysis of the Mary-Church relationships is abetted by their consideration of Christ's mediation. Brilliantly summarized by St. Thomas,⁶⁰ these reflections distinguish a double mediation, a moral mediation of action (*officium coniungendi*) and the ontological mediation (*ratio mediū*) which is its foundation and which demands that the mediator be both distinct from the extremes to be united, and yet somehow communicating with both and thus uniting them.

That these ontological conditions for mediation between Christ and the Church are realized in Mary is seldom explicitly stated, although it is implicit in the insistence on Mary's intermediary position. Richard of St. Lawrence, however, followed by James of Varagine, will make the necessary transposition of the medieval analysis of mediation and apply it to Mary:

⁵⁷ *In festo Pentecostes*, 1, 4; *PL* 183, 327 and 328. St. Albert (*In Luc.*, 1, 48; *ed. cit.*, 10, 67), Richard of St. Lawrence (*De Laudibus*, 8, 1; *ed. cit.*, 227), and Conrad of Saxony (*Speculum B.M.V.*, 14; *ed. cit.*, 275)—all echo these ideas and even the very words of St. Bernard.

⁵⁸ *Fragment*, 4; *PL* 211, 752.

⁵⁹ Cf. E. Druwé, *La médiation universelle de Marie*, in *Maria. Etudes sur la Ste. Vierge*, ed. H. du Manoir, 1 (Paris, 1949) 417-572; J. M. Bover, *Maria Mediatrix*, in *ETL* 6 (1929) 439-462.

⁶⁰ *Summa Theologiae*, 3, q. 26, a. 1 and 2.

72 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

Christus enim in summo, nos in imo; ipsa vero, quae maior est omnibus, sed minor solo Christo, bene describitur esse in medio, quasi communicans cum utroque extremorum, et tanquam nostra ad filium mediatrix. Mater enim Christi per naturam, mater est populi christiani.⁶¹

It is chiefly through metaphor that the mediation of Mary is affirmed, examined, and developed. As Christ is the Head and the Church the Body, so, as the Cantic of Canticles suggests,⁶² she who is between them and unites them by her divine maternity may be called the neck. This analogy, first proposed, it would seem, by a disciple of St. Anselm, Herman of Tournai (+c 1137),⁶³ enjoys a remarkable success, becoming all but universal.⁶⁴ Helinand of Froidmont explains the figure in this fashion:

Scimus quia collo mediante caput unitur corpori et corpus capiti coaptatur. Collum quoque eminentissimum membrum est corporis, et per collum tanquam per fistulam traiecit sibi vitale stomachus alimentum. Quid ergo per collum exprimitur, nisi mediatrix nostra, felix Virgo Maria; quae singulariter eminet in corpore, quod est Ecclesia, per quam meruimus auctorem vitae suscipere, panem scilicet vitae, qui descendit de coelo et dat vitam mundo (Ioann., 6, 33). Per Mariam enim factus est Christus caput et sponsus Ecclesiae, quando Verbum caro factum de virginali procedens utero, tanquam sponsus de thalamo suo (Ps. 18, 6), eandem sibi Ecclesiam connubio iunxit stabili propriamque dedicavit.⁶⁵

⁶¹ *De Laudibus*, 12; *ed. cit.*, 427. James of Varagine (+1298), *Mariale*, 11, (quoted in Bover, *art. cit.*, 447).

⁶² *Cant.* 4, 4: "Sicut turris David collum tuum"; cf. 1, 10 and 7, 4.

⁶³ *De Incarnatione*, 8; *PL* 180, 29 and 30.

⁶⁴ Raoul Ardent, Thomas the Cistercian, John Halgrin of Abbeville, Hugh of St. Cher, William Peraud, St. Albert the Great, Richard of St. Lawrence, James of Varagine—all employ it. Cf. Barré, *art. cit.*, 99.

⁶⁵ *Sermo 22 in Nativitate B. Mariae*, 2; *PL* 212, 667. Cf. *Sermo 19*, 1; *PL* 212, 640. Another metaphor proposed by Hugh of St. Cher (*In Ps. 21*, 15) sees Mary as the heart of Christ or (as with Servas Sanctus of Faenza) of the Church; it meets with no such approval.

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 73

Naturally enough, an analogy which brings out so well and with such specification the fact of Mary's ontological mediation will suggest (as, for that matter, Mary's place itself suggests) its extension to her mediating activity, her moral mediation of action. Emphasis on this vital aspect of mediation is found in a sermon of Amedeus of Lausanne:

In collo, quod ceteris membris eminet, et vitalem gratiam capitis artubus subministrat, altitudo illius exprimitur, quae praesidens membris Ecclesiae, caput suum connectit corpori, quia Christum coniungit Ecclesiae et vitam, quam primo loco suscipit, reliquis membris infundit. Decebat enim ut sicut per feminam mors, sic per feminam vita intraret in orbem terrarum. Et sicut in Eva omnes moriuntur, ita in Maria omnes resurgerent.⁶⁶

Philip of Harvengt (+1183), in common with the growing tendency likewise accents Mary's actual intervention: "bona interventio, bona denique mediatrix, quae iungit quos dis-iunxerat Eva noxia separatrix."⁶⁷ This emphasis is inevitable, for the analysis and clear specification and determination of Mary's place in the Church leads naturally to the consideration of the role she will play with regard to the Body of Christ.

⁶⁶ *Homilia 2, De justificatione vel ornatu Mariae Virginis*; PL 188, 1311 (cf. 1312 and 1343). The antithetical parallelism between Eve and Mary, a traditional patristic comparison (cf. J. Lebon, *L'apostolicité de la doctrine de la médiation mariale*, in RTAM 2 [1930] 129-159), is quite widely adopted in the twelfth century to show that Mary is our mother as well as Christ's (cf. G. Geenen, O.P., *Marie notre Mère. Esquisse historique et évolution doctrinale*, in Mm 10 [1948] 337-352). Cf. Bruno Signiensis (+1124), *Sententiae*, 5, 2 (PL 165-1023); Herman of Tournai, *Tractatus de Incarnatione* 10 (PL 180, 36); Amedeus of Lausanne, *Homilia 4* (PL 188, 1323) and *Homilia 7* (PL 188, 1338); Gueric of Igny, *Sermo 1 in Assumptione B. Mariae*, 4 (PL 185, 188). The comparison and its significant developments will be preserved in the thirteenth century, as with St. Bonaventure (*Collat. 6 de donis Spiritus Sancti*, 20; Quaracchi ed., 5, 487) and Ps.-Albert (*Mariale*, q. 29, p. 18, 3; Borgnet ed., 37, 62).

⁶⁷ *In Cant.*, 2, 7; PL 203, 260.

74 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

B. MARY'S ROLE IN THE CHURCH

If Mary stands between Christ and the Church, if hers is an ontological mediation thereby, then her precise function will of necessity be to unite Christ to the Church, to conjoin Head and Body. The conclusion is evident enough and obvious enough. But how, in the concrete, does Mary fulfill with respect to the Church the role entrusted to her? Medieval authors will specify her mediation as a three-fold movement, beginning with the Incarnation, repeated and intensified on Calvary, and in glory continuing in present activity until the end of time.

1. *The Incarnation.* The mystery of Mary's divine maternity contains within it yet another mystery, her maternal relationship to all mankind: because she is Christ's mother, she also is ours. Aelred (+1167) states the fact clearly:

Per Beatam Mariam multo melius quam per Evam nati sumus, per hoc quod Christus de ea natus fuit. . . . Ipsa est mater nostra, mater vitae nostrae, mater incorruptionis nostrae, mater lucis nostrae. . . . Ideo nobis magis mater quam mater carnis nostrae. Ex ipsa ergo est melior nostra nativitas, quia ex ipsa est nostra nativitas, nostra sanctitas, nostra sapientia, nostra iustitia, nostra sanctificatio, nostra redemptio.⁶⁸

The basic reason for this mysterious and astonishing fact lies in our ontological solidarity with Christ. Thus is she, in Berengaud's words, "mater Ecclesiae, quia eum peperit qui caput est Ecclesiae,"⁶⁹ a point made likewise by Guerric of Igny⁷⁰ and Isaac of Stella,⁷¹ and preserved by St. Bonaventure.⁷²

⁶⁸ *Sermo 20 in Nativitate B. Mariae Virginis*; PL 195, 323.

⁶⁹ *Expositio in Apoc.*; PL 17, 876.

⁷⁰ *Sermo 1 in Assumptione B. Mariae*; PL 185, 188.

⁷¹ *Sermo 42 in Ascensione Domini*; PL 194, 1831. Cf. *Sermo in Assumptione B. Mariae Virginis*; PL 194, 1863.

⁷² *In Assumptione*, 1; Quarachi ed., 9, 688. Cf. St. Albert, *In Luc.*, 1, 28 (Borgnet ed., 22, 64), and *In Matt.*, 16, 16 (Borgnet ed., 20, 637).

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 75

Others will express the same truth by stressing our fraternal relationship with Christ,⁷³ or exploiting the patristic theme which sees the virginal womb of the Mother of God as the bridal chamber where the nuptials of Christ and His Church are celebrated.⁷⁴

But it is not the physical fact of Mary's divine maternity alone which makes her our mother. "By Faith," declares St. Albert, "she becomes the foundation and column of the entire Church."⁷⁵ Her consent, freely given, is given for the entire human race, St. Thomas points out.⁷⁶ These notions bring to the fore Mary's role as co-operator in the work of our salvation, already commented upon by St. Anselm and his immediate disciples: "Qui potuit omnia de nihilo facere, noluit ea violata, nisi prius fieret Mariae filius, reficere. Deus igitur pater rerum creatarum, et Maria est mater rerum recreatarum."⁷⁷ Thus is Mary the spouse of the Father, His helper,

⁷³ Anselm, *Oratio 52 ad S. Virginem Mariam* (PL 158, 957); Herman of Tournai, *Tractatus de Incarnatione Domini*, 10 (PL 180, 36); Guerric ofigny, *Sermo 2 in Nativitate Domini* (PL 185, 33); Philip of Harvengt, *In Cant.*, 2 (PL 203, 286); Adam of Perseigne, *Sermo 1 in Annuntiatione B. Virginis* (PL 211, 703).

⁷⁴ Directly stated by Augustine (*In Ps. 44*, 3; PL 38, 495), the metaphor is employed by Paul the Deacon (+799) (*Homilia 52 in Nativitate B. Mariae Virginis*; PL 95, 1516), Herman of Tournai (*op. cit.*, 9; PL 180, 34), Philip of Harvengt (*op. cit.*, 2; PL 203, 258), Gerhoh of Reichersberg (*Liber de gloria et honore Filii hominis*, 10; PL 194, 1105), and many others. St. Thomas employs it in the thirteenth century, *Summa Theologiae*, 3, q. 30, a. 1; *Lect. super Evang. S. Ioannis*, 2, 2. Cf. J. M. Bover, *Tanquam sponsus procedens de thalamo suo*, in *EE* 4 (1925) 59-73.

⁷⁵ *In Luc.*, 1, 45; Jammy ed., 10, 63.

⁷⁶ *Summa Theologiae*, 3, q. 30, a. 1.

⁷⁷ *Oratio 52*; PL 158, 956. Cf. Eadmer, *De conceptione Virginis Mariae* (PL 159, 315) and *De excellentia Virginis Mariae* (PL 159, 578); Ps.-Eadmer, *De 4 virtutibus B. Mariae*, 8 (PL 159, 586); Ps.-Augustine, *De Symbolo*, 2 (PL 40, 1192); Herman of Tournai, *De Incarnatione*, 11 (PL 180, 36 and 37). As Geenen points out (*art. cit.*, 343), St. Anselm plays a decisive role in bringing medieval thought to consider Mary as our mother.

76 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

a consideration which suggests her co-operation with her Son and the second moment of her mediation.

2. *The Compassion.* Already in the eighth century Ambrose Autpert had seen in Mary's offering at the temple a prefiguration of the offering of Christ and the Church.⁷⁸ Rupert of Deutz, however, goes further, viewing Mary's sorrows on Calvary as the second act by which she becomes our mother,⁷⁹ and Gerhoh follows his master in showing Mary as bearing us in sorrow at the foot of the Cross.⁸⁰ In this climate, and considering the increased appreciation of Mary's co-operation, it is hardly surprising that an Arnold of Bonneval (+1156) could declare, with respect to Calvary: "Omnino tunc erat una Christi et Mariae voluntas, unumque holocaustum ambo pariter offerebant Deo: haec in sanguine cordis, hic in sanguine carnis."⁸¹ Although Christ had no need of her assistance, and she is one of the beneficiaries of His sacrifice, nonetheless, Arnold insists, she is entirely united with Him at this moment—*concrucifigebatur affectu*—and thus co-operates in her own proper way in our Redemption.⁸²

These remarkable affirmations, although repeated to a certain extent by the *Liber Saluatorius*,⁸³ are before their time. They will receive the development they merit only in the thirteenth century, with Richard of St. Lawrence, St. Albert the Great, and Ps.-Albert. The *Mariale* has this expressive text:

Beatissima autem Virgo assumpta est in salutis auxilium et in regni consortium; ipsa enim sola ministris fugientibus compassa est. Unde et sola regni consortium obtinuit, quae laboris adiutrix fuit, iuxta illud: Faciamus ei adiutorium simile sibi.⁸⁴

⁷⁸ *In Purificatione*, 4, 5, 13, and 18; *PL* 92, 330 and 334.

⁷⁹ *In Ioannem*, 13; *PL* 169, 789 and 790.

⁸⁰ *De gloria et honore Filii hominis*, 10, 2; *PL* 194, 1836.

⁸¹ *De Laudibus B. Mariae*; *PL* 189, 1727.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 1731.

⁸³ Quoted in Barré, *art. cit.*, 104.

⁸⁴ *Q.* 43, 2; *ed. cit.*, 42.

The Relationship Between Mary and the Church 77

3. *Mary's Role in Glory.*⁸⁵ That, reigning with her Son in heaven, our Mother retains her solicitude for the Church and powerfully intercedes for us—this is not only a logical conclusion but a fact attested to by innumerable miracles. She is the Mother of grace, these ages of faith proclaim,⁸⁶ of whose fullness—the constant theme of St. Bernard⁸⁷—all receive. Thus is the Mother of Christ still through her actual intervention the Mother of Christians,⁸⁸ the guardian of the Church,⁸⁹ and the Church is the object of her perpetual and efficacious love.⁹⁰

With this last determination of Mary's role, imprecise and undeveloped as it remains, we may close our study of the medieval doctrines on the relations between Mary and the Church. Conrad of Saxony summarizes medieval thought in a passage which contains practical advice for us all, and an invitation to pursue with fervor the investigations so auspiciously begun. It may serve as a fitting end to this paper.

⁸⁵ Many authors of the twelfth century (Eadmer, Rupert of Deutz, Amedeus of Lausanne, Philip of Harvengt) consider Our Lady after the Ascension as teacher of the Apostles and the infant Church (cf. A. Piolanti, *Maria et Ecclesia*, in *ED* 4 [1951] 333-336). This position, which would add another phase to Mary's co-operation, finds little favor in the thirteenth century. St. Thomas states flatly: "Non ordinabatur gratia sua ad plantationem Ecclesiae per modum doctrinae et administrationis sacramentorum, sicut per Apostolos factum est" (*1 Sent.*, dist. 16, q. 1, a. 2, ad 4).

⁸⁶ Amedeus of Lausanne, *Homilia de B. Maria*, 3 (*PL* 188, 1318); Richard of St. Victor, *In Cant.*, 42 (*PL* 196, 524); Adam of Perseigne, *In Assumptione* (*PL* 211, 744).

⁸⁷ *In Dom. infra Assumptionem*, 2; *PL* 183, 420 (cf. 396, 415, 440 and 441).

⁸⁸ Gueric of Igny, *In Nativitate B. Mariae*, 2, 3; *PL* 185, 188 and 189. Cf. *In Assumptione* 1, 3; *PL* 185, 205.

⁸⁹ Philip of Harvengt (?), *Moralitates in Cant.*; *PL* 203, 572.

⁹⁰ *Distinctiones monasticae*, 3, 174; in *Spicilegium Solesmense* (ed. Pira), 3, 130 and 131.

78 *The Relationship Between Mary and the Church*

Ancilla Dominae Mariae est quaelibet anima fidelis, imo etiam Ecclesia universalis. Oculi huius ancillae in manibus dominae suae semper debent esse (Ps. 122, 2), quia oculi Ecclesiae, oculi omnium nostrum ad manus Mariae semper debent respicere, ut per manus eius quidquid boni agimus Domino offeramus. Per manus enim huius Dominae habemus quidquid boni possidemus. . . .⁹¹

FRANCIS L. B. CUNNINGHAM, O.P.
St. Rose Priory
Dubuque, Iowa

⁹¹ *Speculum B. Mariae Virginis*, 3; *ed. cit.*, 241.